

VERMONT OLYMPIANS

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to honor the twenty-two Vermonters who will be representing our country this week at the XVIIIth Winter Olympics in Nagano, Japan. Perhaps Chris Graff of the Associated Press said it best when he noted in an article that appeared in the Rutland Herald that Vermont produces more than its share of Olympians, "... a fact that should surprise no one. There is something about Vermonters and the Vermont spirit that is so keenly associated with the Olympic spirit." Maybe it is the mix of severe weather, Yankee stubbornness, and that New England work ethic that instills in Vermonters an appreciation for hard work and perseverance.

Representing Vermont on the U.S. Men's Ice Hockey Team is the now famous John LeClair from St. Albans. LeClair may play professional hockey for the Philadelphia Flyers, but he has never forgotten his roots in the small city of St. Albans. John donates his time and expertise to the people of Franklin County throughout the year. His skill and All-American image have brought civility and a touch of New England neighborliness to the most unlikely of sports. For the first time ever, the National Hockey League is competing in the Olympics. Vermonters are rooting for John LeClair to leave a lasting impression.

If there is one thing Vermonters excel at it is getting through snow, so it makes sense that Vermont is well represented on the U.S. Olympic Cross Country Ski Teams. Four Vermonters will be on the team; Marc Gilbertson and Laura Wilson of Montpelier, Kerrin Petty from Townshend, and Suzanne King of East Warren. This is Marc's first time as a member of a U.S. national team and I admire his grit in going after his Olympic dream. Laura, Kerrin and Suzanne will bring experience to the women's team and are aiming to show the world what Vermont women are made of.

The Nordic Combined event has Norwich native Tim Tetreault competing. Tim's parents Tom and Anne will be going to Japan this week to watch their son, who has been skiing since he was five, compete in his third Olympic games. The Freestyle U.S. Ski teams also include four skiers and a head coach from Vermont. Ann Battelle from Williston got hooked on skiing during her years at Champlain Valley Union High School and has never looked back. Jim Moran of Stowe and Evan Dybvig of Turnbridge who have both spent many cold hours conquering the slopes of Stowe, will also be competing. Donna Weinbrecht, another team member, knows well all the steep trails and sharp twists at Killington mountain. The four will be joined by coach Jeff Good from Williston.

Skiing comes naturally for Vermonters, but add a rifle and you have a sport Vermonters can really get behind! Seven Vermonters will be doing

just that on the U.S. Biathlon teams—Dan Westover from Colchester, Robert Rosser of Underhill, Kristina Viljanen-Sabasteanski of Richmond, Deborah Nordyke from Jericho, Kara Salmela of Bolton Valley, Algis Shalna (head coach) from Williston, and Timothy Derrick (assistant coach) of Jericho. Head Coach Shalna brings with him Olympic experience having competed for the Soviet Union's Gold Medal winning team in the 1984 Winter Olympics. The group has been training at a state-of-the-art Vermont National Guard facility in Jericho—which will be hosting the World Junior Biathlon Championships just after the Olympics.

New to the Olympics but familiar to Vermont is snowboarding. As the birth place of this sport and home to Jake Burton's renowned snowboard company, it is appropriate that Vermont will be sending three talented competitors as part of the first U.S. Snowboarding Team. Ross Powers from South Londonderry, Ron Chiodi of Rochester, and Betsy Shaw of East Dorset will be traveling to Nagano this week. Ross knows all about travel since snowboarding has taken him all over the world. He will celebrate his nineteenth birthday on February 10th and be joined by his mother, Nancy, in Japan. East Dorset will be cheering for their neighbor, Betsy, who has "surfed" mountains all over the globe but knows the ones in Southern Vermont best. Ron too will bring his Vermont experience at Stratton Mountain with him to the Olympics.

Also going to Nagano, Japan is Vermontor Kathryn Vigessa Lipke of Belvidere. She will be serving as one of five international jurors who will judge the snow-sculpting competitions. Having lived in the mountains of Belvidere with its snowy peaks and dense woods, Kathryn will make an excellent judge of cold weather beauty.

I am truly proud of the athletes Vermont is sending to the Olympics. I commend them for their hard work and the example they set for Vermonters and for athletes everywhere, and join all Vermonters in wishing them the best in the 1998 Winter Olympics. •

PROTECTION OF THE AMERICAN FLAG FROM PHYSICAL DESECRATION

• Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I am proud to join Senators HATCH, CLELAND, and others in cosponsoring the proposed constitutional amendment to grant the States and Congress the power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States. Our flag occupies a truly unique place in the hearts of millions of citizens as a cherished symbol of freedom and democracy. As a national emblem of the world's greatest democracy, the American flag should be treated with respect and care. I have long held that our free speech rights do not entitle us to consider the flag as merely personal property, to be treated

any way we see fit, including its desecration for the purpose of political protest. I want to commend Senator HATCH for once again leading us in this very worthwhile cause.

Mr. President, with the introduction of this resolution, we resume our effort to protect the greatest symbol of the American experience. There is no more powerful symbol of freedom, democracy, and our commitment to those principles that the American flag, and it is altogether just that we try to ensure that it is publicly displayed with pride, dignity, and honor. Make no mistake, Mr. President, the flag is not merely a visual symbol to us, nor should it be. Too many Americans have contributed too much of their labor, their passion, and in some cases their very being for it to be so simply regarded. For the flag permeates our national history and relays the story of America in its simplest terms. Indeed, knowing how the flag has changed—and in what ways it has remained constant—is to know the history and hopes of this country.

More than 220 years ago, a year after the colonies had made their historic decision to declare independence from Britain, the Second Continental Congress decided that the American flag would consist of 13 red and white alternating stripes and 13 white stars in a field of blue. These stars and blue field were to represent a new constellation in which freedom and government of the people, by the people and for the people would rule. As we all know, the constellation has grown to include 50 stars, but the number of stripes has remained constant. In this way, the flag tells all who view it that no matter how large America may become, it is forever rooted in the bedrock principles of freedom and self-government that led those first 13 colonies to forge a new nation.

Equally important is the fact that the flag also represents our commitment to these ideals. This commitment has exacted a high human toll, for which many of America's best and brightest have given their last full measure of devotion. It is in their memories and for their commitment to America's ideals that I am proud to support the amendment introduced yesterday.

The amendment is necessary because the Supreme Court, in its 1990 U.S. versus Eichman ruling, held that burning the flag in political protest was constitutionally protected free speech. No one holds our right to free speech more dearly than I do, Mr. President, but in my view, the Eichman decision unnecessarily rejects the deeply held reverence in which millions of Americans hold our flag. With all the forums for public opinion available to Americans every day, from television and radio, to newspapers and internet chat rooms, Americans are afforded ample opportunity to freely and fully exercise their legitimate, constitutional right to free speech, even if what they have

to say is overwhelmingly unpopular with a majority of American citizens. Simply put, protecting the flag from desecration poses no serious threat to the exercise of free speech in America.

We must also remember that this constitutional amendment is carefully drafted to simply allow the Congress and individual State legislatures to enact laws prohibiting the physical desecration of the flag, if they so choose. It certainly does not stipulate or require that such laws be enacted, although many States and the Federal Government have already demonstrated widespread support for doing so. In fact, prior to the Supreme Court's rulings on this issue, 48 States, including my own State of Maine, and the Federal Government has anti-flag-burning laws on their books for years. So really what we do with this resolution is give the American flag the protection that almost all the States, the Federal Government, and a large majority of the American people have already endorsed.

Protecting the flag also enjoys widespread support in Congress. During the 104th Congress, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a flag protection resolution, and 63 Senators supported a resolution identical to this one. Just last year, the House or Representatives, to its credit, reaffirmed its commitment to the sanctity of the American flag by once again passing a flag protection resolution with ease. Now it is time for the Senate to show a similar commitment.

Whether our flag is flying over Fenway Park, a military base, a school, or on a flag pole on Main Street, the stars and stripes have always represented the ideals and values that are the foundation of this great Nation. Our flag has come to not only represent the pride we have for our Nation's past glories, but also to stand for the hope we all harbor for our Nation's future. Mr. President, it is with this pride and hope that I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

PAYMENT OF AN EQUITABLE CLAIM TO DR. BEATRICE BRAUDE

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today with good news. We have at long last seen a measure of justice in a case which brings back memories of an awful time in our nation's history.

In 1953 Dr. Beatrice Braude, a linguist, was wrongfully dismissed from her position at the United States Information Agency and was subsequently blacklisted by the Federal government as a result of accusations of disloyalty to the United States. The accusations were old. Two years earlier the State Department's Loyalty Security Board had investigated and unanimously voted to dismiss them. The Board sent a letter to Dr. Braude stating "there is no reasonable doubt as to your loyalty to the United States Government or as to your security risk to the Department of State." Despite this, her name was not cleared.

Dr. Braude was terminated one day after being praised for her work and informed that she would probably be promoted. She was told that her termination was due to budgetary constraints, but the truth was that she was selected for termination because of the old—and answered—charges against her. Because she did not know the real reason for her dismissal, she was denied certain procedural rights, including the right to request a hearing.

Over time she grew suspicious. When she was unable, over the course of several years, to secure employment anywhere else in the Federal government—even in a typing pool despite a perfect score on the typing test—she became convinced that she had been blacklisted. The Privacy Act of 1974 enabled her to obtain her government files and confirm her suspicions. She invested much time and energy fighting to regain Federal employment and restore her reputation. She was partially successful. In 1982, at the age of 69, she was hired as a language instructor in the CIA. Sadly, she still had not been able to clear her name by the time of her death in 1988. The irony of the charges against Dr. Braude is that she was an anti-communist, having witnessed first-hand Communist-sponsored terrorism in Europe while she was an assistant cultural affairs officer in Paris and, for a brief period, an exchange officer in Bonn during the late 1940's and early 1950's.

Mr. President, I have reviewed the charges against Dr. Braude before on the floor of the Senate, but I think that they merit repeating because they are illustrative of that dark era and are instructive to us even today. There were a total of four charges. First, she was briefly a member of the Washington Book Shop on Farragut Square that the Attorney General later labeled subversive. Second, she had been in contact with Mary Jane Keeney, a Communist Party activist employed at the United Nations. Third, she had been a member of the State Department unit of the Communist-dominated Federal Workers' Union. Fourth, she was an acquaintance of Judith Coplon.

With regard to the first charge, Dr. Braude had indeed joined the Book Shop shortly after her arrival in Washington in 1943. She was eager to meet congenial new people and a friend recommended the Book Shop, which hosted music recitals in the evenings. I must express some sensitivity here: my F.B.I. records report that I was observed several times at a "leftist musical review" in suburban Hampstead while I was attending the London School of Economics on a Fulbright Fellowship.

Dr. Braude was aware of the undercurrent of sympathy with the Russian cause at the Book Shop, but her membership paralleled a time of close U.S.-Soviet collaboration. She drifted away from the Book Shop in 1944 because of

her distaste for the internal politics of other active members. Her membership at the Book Shop was only discovered when her name appeared on a list of delinquent dues. It appears that her most sinister crime while a member of the book shop was her failure to return a book on time.

Dr. Braude met Mary Jane Keeney on behalf of a third woman who actively aided Nazi victims after the war and was anxious to send clothing to another woman in occupied Germany. Dr. Braude knew nothing of Keeney's political orientation and characterized the meeting as a transitory experience.

With regard to the third charge, Dr. Braude, in response to an interrogatory from the State Department's Loyalty Security Board, argued that she belonged to an anti-Communist faction of the State Department unit of the Federal Workers' Union.

Remember that the Loyalty Security Board investigated these charges and exonerated her.

The fourth charge, which Dr. Braude certainly did not—or could not—deny, was her friendship with Judith Coplon. Braude met Coplon in the summer of 1945 when both women attended a class Herbert Marcuse taught at American University. They saw each other infrequently thereafter. In May 1948, Coplon wrote to Braude, then stationed in Paris and living in a hotel on the Left Bank, to announce that she would be visiting shortly and needed a place to stay. Dr. Braude arranged for Coplon to stay at the hotel. Coplon stayed for 6 weeks, during which time Dr. Braude found her behavior very trying. The two parted on unfriendly terms. The friendship they had prior to parting was purely social.

Mr. President, Judith Coplon was a spy. She worked in the Justice Department's Foreign Agents Registration Division, an office integral to the FBI's counter-intelligence efforts. She was arrested early in 1949 while handing over notes on counterintelligence operations to Soviet citizen Valentine Gubitchev, a United Nations employee. Coplon was tried and convicted—there was no doubt of her guilt—but the conviction was overturned on a technicality. Gubitchev was also convicted but was allowed to return to the U.S.S.R. because of his quasi-diplomatic status.

Judith Coplon was a spy. Beatrice Braude was not. We know that Judith Coplon was not alone as a Soviet spy; though there were not as many as one might have imagined given the American response. In 1956, Edward A. Shils captured the overreaction to Communist activities in the United States in his fine, small study, *The Torment of Secrecy: The Background and Consequences of American Security Policy*. "The American visage began to cloud over," Shils wrote. "Secrets were to become our chief reliance just when it was becoming more and more evident that the Soviet Union had long maintained an active apparatus for espionage in the United States. For a